

**BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of:

CLAIMANT

and

GOLDEN GATE REGIONAL CENTER, Service Agency

DDS No. CS0031247

OAH No. 2025101052

DECISION

Administrative Law Judge Karen Reichmann, State of California, Office of Administrative Hearings, served as the hearing officer and heard this matter on November 12, 2025, by telephone and videoconference.

Claimant was represented by her mother. Claimant was not present.

Lisa Rosene represented Golden Gate Regional Center (GGRC), the service agency.

The record remained open for the submission of written closing arguments.

Claimant's closing argument was timely received and marked as Exhibit A.

GGRC did not submit a closing argument.

The record closed and the matter was submitted for decision on December 5, 2025.

ISSUE

Has GGRC failed to assist claimant to recover reimbursement for transportation expenses from vendor PPL?

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Claimant is an adult client of GGRC.

2. Claimant and GGRC are parties to an Individual Program Plan (IPP).

Pursuant to the IPP, GGRC funds transportation services for claimant, including mileage reimbursement for claimant's mother and public transportation passes.

Claimant's mother submits invoices for reimbursement of claimant's travel expenses to PPL, a GGRC vendor located out of state.

3. On October 21, 2025, claimant's mother contacted Julie Gin, claimant's case manager, and reported that invoices submitted to PPL for transportation reimbursement had been denied. Gin contacted PPL that day. The person she spoke to later told Gin that no invoices had been received. Gin forwarded this information to claimant's mother. Claimant's mother sent Gin a "screenshot" of three invoices. Gin called PPL again and was assured that a case had been opened to investigate claimant's report of unpaid invoices.

4. On October 31, 2025, Gin again called PPL and a PPL staff member reported that the situation was still being reviewed. Gin sent a follow up email to another staff member at PPL. This individual notified Gin on November 4, 2025, that she was personally working on the issue. This was Gin's last interaction with PPL prior to the November 12, 2025, hearing date.

5. Claimant requests an order directing GGRC to "comply with Claimant's request for assistance." Claimant alleges that GGRC has committed repeated blatant violations of the Lanterman Act related to its failure to provide services, necessitating her to file numerous fair hearing requests over the last 10 years, including other requests involving transportation reimbursement from PPL.

6. GGRC requests dismissal of the appeal, noting that no service has been denied and no Notice of Action has been issued. GGRC expressed frustration with claimant's mother for repeatedly filing fair hearing requests.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Lanterman Act), the State of California accepts responsibility for persons with developmental disabilities. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4500 et seq.)¹ The Lanterman Act mandates that an "array of services and supports should be established . . . to meet the needs and choices of each person with developmental disabilities . . . and to support their integration into the mainstream life of the community." (§ 4501.) Regional centers have the responsibility of carrying out the state's responsibilities to the

¹ All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

developmentally disabled under the Lanterman Act. (§ 4620, subd. (a).) The Lanterman Act directs regional centers to develop and implement an IPP for each individual who is eligible for services, setting forth the services and supports needed by the consumer to meet his or her goals and objectives. (§ 4646.) The determination of which services and supports are necessary is made after analyzing the needs and preferences of the consumer, the range of service options available, the effectiveness of each option in meeting the goals of the IPP, and the cost of each option. (§§ 4646, 4646.5 & 4648.)

2. GGRC has agreed to fund transportation expenses for claimant.

3. The evidence established that GGRC promptly contacted PPL upon claimant's mother reporting that there were unpaid invoices. GGRC followed up with PPL several times during the three-week period between the initial request and the date of the hearing.

4. The evidence established that claimant has repeatedly complained to GGRC about challenges obtaining transportation reimbursement from PPL. It was not established whether alternatives to PPL are available or have been considered.

5. On this record, claimant has not established that GGRC has failed to assist her in obtaining reimbursement for travel expenses. GGRC has been actively assisting claimant by contacting PPL and has authorized payment of the expenses. Claimant has not established that GGRC has violated the Lanterman Act. Accordingly, the appeal must be denied.

ORDER

Claimant's appeal is denied.

DATE:

KAREN REICHMANN

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings

NOTICE

This is the final administrative decision. Each party is bound by this decision. Either party may request reconsideration pursuant to subdivision (b) of Welfare and Institutions Code section 4713 within 15 days of receiving the decision, or appeal the decision to a court of competent jurisdiction within 180 days of receiving the final decision.